



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,580	12/28/2001	Gary R. Eddy	EDD002USPT01	9162

23403 7590 03/28/2003

SHERRILL LAW OFFICES
4756 BANNING AVE
SUITE 212
WHITE BEAR LAKE, MN 55110-3205

EXAMINER

MARSH, STEVEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3632

DATE MAILED: 03/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/033,580

Applicant(s)

EDDY, GARY R.

Examiner

Steven M Marsh

Art Unit

3632

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 18-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-16 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ 6) ☐ Other: ____

DETAILED ACTION

This is the first office action for U.S. Application 10/033,580 for an Eaves Trough Support Bracket filed by Gary R. Eddy on December 28, 2001.

Drawings

The proposed drawing correction and/or the proposed substitute sheets of drawings, filed on December 26, 2002 have been approved. A proper drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The correction to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 8, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Applicant claims that the main beam, first leg, and second leg define a concavity accessible from the first transverse direction whereby the bracket is transversely nestable. The specification

Art Unit: 3632

shows a cavity in the bracket, but it does not disclose or suggest any embodiments where the bracket is transversely nestable.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant claims that a primary rib formed within the main beam and the strut, longitudinally overlaps the first leg and the second leg. The rib (131) disclosed by Applicant does not appear to overlap the first and second leg. This claim has been examined to the best extent possible.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 10-13, 16, and 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramser in view of U.S. Patent 3,041,033 to Schwartz. Ramser discloses an eaves trough support bracket that can be formed from a unitary planar metal blank, with a main beam (7) that has longitudinally spaced distal and proximal ends, laterally spaced first and second edges, and transversely spaced first and second surfaces. There is a connection element (11) extending in a first transverse direction

Art Unit: 3632

from the distal end of the main beam and a hook (12) extending in the first transverse direction and a second longitudinal direction from the proximal end of the main beam with a concavity open (18) in a second transverse direction. First and second legs (8) extend in a second transverse direction from the first and second edges of the main beam, respectively, and have proximal longitudinal ends substantially transversely aligned with the proximal end of the main beam. The bracket has a laterally extending first bend line (15) along a transition line from the main beam to the connection element and a laterally extending second bend line along a transition line from the main beam to the hook.

The hook has a transversely extending shaft portion (13) with a first end connected to the proximal end of the main beam and a second end extending in the first transverse direction from the proximal end of the main beam, a hooking portion with a first end connected to the second end of the shaft and a second end extending away from the distal end of the main beam in a second longitudinal direction from the second end of the shaft, and a transversely extending extension portion (14) with a first end connected to the second end of the hooking portion and a second end extending in the second transverse direction from the second end of the hooking portion. There is a longitudinally aligned hole (18) through each of the shaft and extension portions of the hook effective for accommodating partial passage of a mechanical fastener (17) throughout the holes. The bracket also has a fourth and fifth bend line along transition lines from the main beam to the first and second legs, respectively.

Ramser does not disclose a bracket wherein the main beam, first leg, and second leg define a concavity accessible from the first transverse direction whereby the support bracket could be transversely nestable. Schwartz discloses a support bracket with a main beam (12), as well as first and second legs (18) that define a concavity accessible from the first transverse direction. The bracket can fit over a stud or it could be transversely nestable. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have provided a leg arrangement such as the one taught by Schwartz, in place of the leg arrangement that includes flanges as taught by Ramser, for the purpose of allowing the bracket to fit over an object or be nestable with an object. Nor does Ramser disclose a support bracket with first and second legs that have a height that tapers so that the height at the center is half the height at the proximal longitudinal end of the leg. However, the support bracket taught by Schwartz does teach legs with a height that decreases in a tapered fashion. The exact ratio between the longitudinal end of the leg and the center is a matter of engineering preference and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention.

Claims 4, 6-9, 15, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramser in view of Schwartz, and if further view of Odekirk. Ramser in view of Schwartz does not disclose a connection element with a strut extending in a transverse direction from the beam and a tab extending in a second longitudinal direction from the strut. Nor does Ramser in view of Schwartz disclose ribs located at the bend lines for strengthening the bracket. Odekirk discloses an aluminum gutter

Art Unit: 3632

support bracket with a main beam having longitudinally spaced distal and proximal ends, laterally spaced first and second edges, and transversely spaced first and second surfaces. There is a connection element (60) extending in a first transverse direction from the distal end of the main beam and a hook at a second longitudinal direction from the proximal end of the main beam. The connection element has strut (62) with a first transverse end connected to the distal end of the main beam and a second transverse end extending in a first transverse direction from the distal end of the main beam.

There is a tab (64) with a longitudinal end connected to the second transverse end of the strut and a second transverse end extending in a second longitudinal direction from the second transverse end of the strut, with a laterally extending third bend line along a transition line from the strut to the tab. Odekirk also discloses ribs located at the bend lines of the bracket (see fig. 2) for strengthening the bracket. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have substituted the connection element taught by Ramser in view of Schwartz, with the connection element taught by Odekirk, for the purpose of providing a connection element that could support a gutter with a different configuration. It also would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention to have provided ribs at the bend lines of the bracket taught by Ramser in view of Schwartz, as taught by Odekirk, for the purpose of strengthening the bracket. The specific location of the ribs with respect to each other is a matter of engineering preference and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramser in view of Schwartz. Ramser in view of Schwartz does not specifically disclose a bracket wherein the longitudinal ends of the first and second legs independently have a transverse height of about .5 to 1.5 inches, but that is a matter of engineering preference and would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the present invention.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 3-16, and 18-22 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3632

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven Marsh whose telephone number is (703) 305-0098. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM to 4:30 PM. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3597.


Steven Marsh

March 21, 2003


ANITA KING
PRIMARY EXAMINER